DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 301 HE 023 489

TITLE	The Strategic Study Group on the Status of Women: Report to the President and the Commission for Women--Recommendation Package #3.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park.
PUB DATE	Jul 87
NOTE	46p.; For related documents, see HE 023 487-492.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Classroom Environment; *Dual Career Family; Employed Women; Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Recruitment; Females; Grievance Procedures; Higher Education; Needs Assessment; *Personnel Management; Sex Bias; *Sex Fairness; Staff Development; State Universities; Teacher Employment Benefits; Teacher Persistence
IDENTIFIERS	*Pennsylvania State University

ABSTRACT

The document presents partial recommendations of a Pennsylvania State University Study Group on the Status of Women at the University. Recommendations concern "chilly" classroom climate, dual career recruitment and retention, and employee relations and representation. Among specific recommendations are the following: (1) study the classroom climate for women at Pennsylvania State University (PSU) and commit institutional resources, as necessary, to improve it; (2) implement strategies that will improve PSU's ability to attract and retain dual career couples; and (3) review the current personnel representative system and make necessary changes to increase its effectiveness and to facilitate the dissemination of personnel information. For each recommendation there is a discussion of the problem and its background and the rationale for the recommendation. Twenty-eight references are listed. Various forms, a faculty leaving questionnaire, data files, and an employer listing are appended. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED319301

The Strategic Study Group on the Status of Women

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE COMMISSION FOR WOMEN

Recommendation Package #3

July 1987

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
PA STATE UNIVERSITY
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 023 489

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Members i

Summary of Recommendations iv

I. Recommendation I: "Chilly" Classroom Climate
- General Recommendation 1
- Overview 1
- Faculty Attitudes and Behavior 1
- The Penn State Environment 6
- Self-Study at Penn State 8
- Need for Modeling and Mentoring 10
- Implementation Recommendations 11
- References 14

II. Recommendation J: Dual Career Recruitment and Retention
- General Recommendation 16
- Statement of the Problem 16
- Specific Problems and Possible Solutions 17
- Implementation Recommendations 20
- References 23

III. Recommendation K: Employee Relations and Representation
- General Recommendation 24
- Statement of the Problem 24
- Implementation Recommendations 27

Appendix A. Questionnaires, Data File, List of Employees A-1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Strategic Study Group on the Status of Women

LIST OF MEMBERS

Dr. Kathryn Moore, Chair
Professor of Education, Director
Center for the Study of Higher Education

Dr. Deborah F. Atwater (10/85 to 6/86)
Assistant Professor of Speech Communications
Delaware Campus

Ms. Suzanne Brooks
Affirmative Action Officer

Ms. Lee Carpenter (10/85 to 6/86)
Graduate Student, Comparative Literature
College of the Liberal Arts

Dr. Sabrina Chapman
Director
Center for Women Students

Ms. Nancy Cline
Librarian/Assistant Dean
University Libraries

Ms. Beverly A. Crabtree
Secretary
Altoona Campus

Dr. Vincent DeSanctis
Campus Executive Officer
Shenango Valley Campus

Dr. Mary M. Dupuis
Professor of Education
College of Education

Ms. Cheryl E. Ebel
Assistant Professor of Engineering
Capital College

Ms. Dana Froke (from 5/86)
Undergraduate Student, General Arts and Sciences
College of the Liberal Arts

Ms. Marilyn Gilligan
Table Attendant
Nittany Lion Inn

Ms. Carol Gilmore (5/86 to 8/86)
Undergraduate Student, Telecommunications
School of Communications

Dr. Barbara Gray
Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior
College of Business Administration

Ms. Ronda K. Heltman
Secretary
College of Engineering

Ms. Dara J. Klein (10/85 to 12/86)
Undergraduate Student, Marketing
College of Business Administration

Dr. Edward H. Klevans
Professor and Head of Nuclear Engineering
College of Engineering

Ms. Donna J. Marthouse
Research Aide
College of Agriculture

Ms. Kathryn J. Martin
Accounting Assistant
Milton S. Hershey Medical Center

Dr. Emilia Martinez-Brawley (10/85 to 4/87)
Professor of Social Work
College of the Liberal Arts

Ms. Cheryl Mobley (from 5/86)
Graduate Student, Educational Administration
College of Education

Dr. M. Eloise Murray (10/85 to 5/86)
Associate Professor of Home Economics Education
College of Education

Mr. Michael O'Connell (10/85 to 5/86)
Undergraduate Student, Prelaw
College of the Liberal Arts

Dr. Carolyn Sachs
Assistant Professor of Rural Sociology
College of Agriculture

Ms. Mary L. Selders (5/86 to 2/87)
Graduate Student, Educational Theory and Policy
College of Education

Ms. Betty Stanford (10/85 to 2/87)
Laboratory Assistant, Photographics
Commonwealth Educational System

Ms. Nancy Struble
Secretary
University Libraries

Dr. Marylee C. Taylor (from 8/86)
Associate Professor of Sociology and Education
College of the Liberal Arts

Ms. Jean Templin
Graduate Student, College of Education
Liaison, Commission for Women

Dr. M. Lee Upcraft
Director of Counseling and Health Services

Mr. James M. Wagner
Assistant Vice President for Business and Human Resources

Mr. Vernis M. Welmon
Assistant to the Dean for Minority Relations
and International Programs
College of Business Administration

Dr. Janet Williamson
Associate Professor of Nursing
College of Health and Human Development

Ms. Anne K. Yeager
Undergraduate Student, Science
College of Science

STAFF

Dr. Michael P. Johnson
Research Director
Associate Professor of Sociology

Ms. Sandra J. Engelsson
Research Assistant (from 10/86)

Ms. Elizabeth Ehrich
Statistical Analyst

Mr. Louis Fabian
Planning Analyst
Office of Planning and Analysis

Dr. Ann K. Nelsen
Senior Planning Analyst
Office of Planning and Analysis

Ms. H. Sue Santalucia
Secretary (10/85 to 10/86)

Ms. Barbara W. Vendetti
Secretary (from 10/86)

Summary of Recommendations

Recommendation Package #3 contains recommendations in three areas: (1) "chilly" classroom climate, (2) dual career recruitment and retention, and (3) employee relations and representation.

I. "Chilly" Classroom Climate
(General Recommendation I)

Study the classroom climate for women at Penn State and commit institutional resources, as necessary, to improve it.

I.1: The Office of the President should direct the appropriate offices to study the classroom climate for women and minorities by campus and by college to determine specific problems and issues unique to each area (see, for example, College of Agriculture report).

I.2: The Office of the President should require the inclusion of classroom climate issues in student and peer evaluations of instruction.

I.3: The Office of the President should charge the appropriate office(s) to develop handbooks for unit heads and program heads (one for the Graduate School and one for Undergraduate Programs) that include information on climate and ways to assess and improve it.

I.4: The Office of the President should plan and conduct workshops to help unit heads, program heads, and faculty recognize the importance of classroom climate and practice ways to improve the climate. The Center for Women Students currently conducts such workshops on a limited scale and can serve as a resource for implementing this recommendation.

I.5: In instructional units that are overwhelmingly male, the unit head should develop strategies to encourage women students and faculty to interact with other women. Such strategies might include participation in professional societies (e.g., the Society of Women Engineers), the provision of counseling staff as in the College of Business Administration, and the utilization of support programs for women that are provided by Career Development and Placement Service and by Counseling and Psychological Services.

I.6: The Center for Women Students should be supported in its continuing efforts to offer regular workshops to help women, especially graduate students, prepare for and handle the problems of interaction between faculty and students.

I.7: The Office of the President should implement policies and strategies whose objective is to decrease the women student/women faculty ratio in order to increase opportunities for role modeling and mentoring. A first step should be to increase the number of women faculty through vigorous recruitment and retention efforts (see Study Group Recommendations B, D, and G in Recommendation Packages 1 and 2).

I.8: The Graduate Council should study the gender imbalance in faculty to student ratios within the Graduate School, attending especially to the number and areas of specialization of women on the graduate faculty and to the need for mentors.

II. Dual Career Recruitment and Retention
(General Recommendation J)

Implement strategies that will improve Penn State's ability to attract and retain dual career couples.

J.1: Develop a data base that will document why faculty and staff refuse offers or choose to relocate away from the University. Include in this data base information on searches that failed; tenured, tenure-track, and fixed-term I faculty who leave the University for another location; and individuals who are offered positions at Penn State but fail to accept them. An annual review of these data should be compiled, possibly by the Affirmative Action Office.

J.2: Expand the existing University-wide file of positions (which currently covers staff exempt and nonexempt openings) to include faculty, clerical, and technical service positions available at both University Park and other campus locations. To the extent possible, expand this file to include positions that are expected to become available within the near future. Make this file available on-line to individual job applicants, deans, department heads, campus executive officers, personnel representatives, and so on, in addition to employees of the Office of Human Resources.

J.3: Provide the existing Spouse Employment Assistance Program (to be renamed the Dual Career Employment Assistance Program) with a full-time professional and at least part-time clerical support. At University Park, establish more extensive contacts with Centre Region employers; at other locations, consider development of similar regional cooperative efforts. Provide access to a computerized job file (see Recommendation J.2) so that applicants can browse through continually updated lists of employment possibilities. Publish a University-wide newsletter with updated employment information and other items of interest to help maintain contact with those individuals who do not immediately find positions and to assist deans and department heads in their recruiting efforts.

J.4: Make the University's positive attitude toward dual career couples more explicit in the recruitment and hiring processes. Provide information to applicants identifying advantages Penn State has to offer the dual career family. For example, information brochures could indicate the existence of the Dual Career Employment Assistance Program. Implement related Study Group recommendations on day care, flexible scheduling, family-responsive benefits, and part-time appointments.

J.5: At the same time that positive efforts toward recruitment of dual career couples are being instituted, affirmative action principles and guidelines must be kept firmly in mind. Search committees should make every effort not to exclude women candidates based on the probability of their partners' employment. Dual career issues must not be allowed to become a basis for discrimination against women.

III. Employee Relations and Representation
(General Recommendation K)

Review the current personnel representative system and make necessary changes to increase its effectiveness and to facilitate the dissemination of personnel information. Review and revise the grievance policies and procedures for nonacademic personnel to create a climate more conducive to redressing employee problems.

K.1: Develop a plan to phase out the current system of personnel representatives and establish full-time human resource officer positions with well-defined qualifications. Hire employees with professional human resource

training to fill these positions. Increase the number of regional human resource officers to better represent employees at non-University Park locations. These human resource officers should be appointed by and report to the Office of Human Resources. Steps should be taken to ensure a high level of representation of women and minorities as human resource officers.

K.2: As a short term, interim measure (until Recommendation K.1 can be fully implemented) establish a training program for all personnel representatives (administered by the Office of Human Resources) that will bring them up-to-date on all internal and external policies governing personnel practices at Penn State. Incumbents should be given refresher courses annually and encouraged to take courses in human resource management theory and practice.

K.3: Review and revise the grievance procedures for non-academic personnel to create a climate more conducive to resolving employee problems. Insure that the rights of employees are understood by workers and supervisors, and that workers can use the appeal process without fear of recrimination.

K.4: Set up a means by which all University employees can obtain confidential information from the Office of Human Resources. Consider the establishment of an 800 toll-free telephone number for employees at locations other than University Park, and include an answering service to permit employees to call during periods other than the 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. work day.

I. "CHILLY" CLASSROOM CLIMATE

General Recommendation I

Study the classroom climate for women at Penn State and commit institutional resources, as necessary, to improve it.

Overview

Classroom climate involves some of the most important aspects of the academic environment. Although professor and student interaction in the classroom is a critical element in the quality of education and has long been a focus of educational research, research on gender differences in the classroom experience has a shorter history (Hall & Sandler 1982; Jackson & Lahanderne 1967; Maeroff 1985; Sadker & Sadker 1979). This "chilly classroom climate" research addresses the following question: Do the dynamics of classroom interaction give an advantage to the prototypic white male student while putting women, minorities, and nontraditional students at a disadvantage? The evidence is growing (Hall & Sandler 1982) that the educational experiences of women, minorities, and nontraditional students differ greatly from those of men, even when they attend the same institutions and share the same classrooms.

Faculty Attitudes and Behavior

Although many persons and experiences can help shape the campus climate, faculty attitudes and behaviors often have a profound effect, especially on women students (Katz 1970). Hall and Sandler (1982) stress that although most faculty want to treat all students fairly, some faculty may overtly, or more often inadvertently, treat men and women students differently in the classroom and in related learning situations. The small differential behaviors that often occur in the course of everyday interchanges frequently extend into the academic environment. Because everyday inequities usually occur without either party's full awareness of exactly what has happened, they are often difficult to identify and to change. As Hall and Sandler note, in the

college context such behaviors can have profound cumulative and lasting ramifications, such as distorting a teacher's and student's evaluation of performance with preconceived negative expectations about women's abilities; provoking and reinforcing expected behaviors that are inappropriate in the academic setting; draining women students' energies in conflict, anger, and self-doubt; and provoking feelings of helplessness, especially when there are no channels for discussion and no appropriate actions or remedies available.

Faculty behaviors that can have these effects include but are not limited to the following:

- ignoring women students while recognizing men students, even when women clearly volunteer to participate in class,
- calling directly on men students but not on women students,
- calling men students by name more often than women students,
- addressing the class as if no women were present,
- "coaching" men but not women students in working toward a fuller answer by probing for additional elaboration or explanation,
- waiting longer for men than for women to answer a question before going on to another student,
- interrupting women students,
- asking men higher-order questions,
- responding more extensively to men's comments,
- using classroom examples which reflect traditional stereotypes, and
- using the generic "he" or "man" to represent both men and women.

Current research suggests that both men and women students are aware of the subtle messages conveyed by faculty in the classroom. A recent study at West Chester University (Crawford 1986) reports that male students perceive the overall classroom climate more favorably than females do. Women reported that they received less praise and encouragement than their male counterparts reported and were more likely to be known by name to their female instructors only. They were also less likely to participate in class than men. Women reported that

instructors sometimes overlooked their attempts to contribute to discussions; and that they sometimes felt insecure or had been intimidated, humiliated, "put down," or discouraged by their instructors. Other studies also indicate that male faculty tend to support students of their own sex more than students of the other sex; furthermore, they often perceive women students primarily as sexual beings who are less capable and less serious than men students. Because of the disproportionately large number of male faculty, women students may not get the same amount or kind of attention as male students. Whether overt or subtle, the results of differential treatment based on sex are far from innocuous. The cumulative effects of such treatment can be damaging not only to the individual but also to the educational process itself.

Populations Especially Affected

Research indicates that some students may be more affected by classroom climate than others. Hall and Sandler (1982) note that the populations who may be especially affected by the negative classroom climate include women graduate students, women in traditionally "masculine" fields, minority women students, and older women students.

Title IX mandates that qualified women must have equal access to all graduate programs; however, once they are on campus, women who pursue graduate study often face a chilly climate. The climate is especially "male" at institutions such as Penn State where there are considerably more male than female faculty members at the graduate and professional school level. The style of the classroom interchange is often more competitive. The proportion of women students is often smaller. Despite the fact that they are highly self-selected and often begin study with a better grade point average (GPA) than their male classmates (Adler 1976), women graduate students frequently encounter even more doubt on the part of faculty and others about their seriousness of purpose than do women undergraduates. Many women have been told by faculty and by department chairs that while their competence is not questioned, their commitment is.

The risks of refusing an advisor's advances, or of responding negatively to an advisor's jokes or comments, are especially high for

graduate students. They typically have more to lose in these circumstances than undergraduates because their options for curricula and mentorship are more limited. For example, graduate students frequently have a limited pool of faculty from which to choose an advisor or mentor. Graduate students commit to a course of study which has long-term career implications; therefore, changing direction to escape a "chilly" climate has high personal costs. The costs of staying in a "chilly" program and trying to cope are equally grim. At graduate levels, the importance of mentorship is critical. Since graduate programs are less structured, individual faculty members' advice on courses or research directions are more important. The close working relationship between graduate student and mentor makes the need for positive role models greater, just as it increases the potential for abuse. The graduate student's professional future is tied to the advisor's support and effectiveness. Faculty behaviors set the tone for student colleagues, and colleague networks are more important for graduate students. All of these considerations become ever more important as we work to increase the number of top level graduate students at Penn State.

Departmental and classroom climate may also be a factor in women's continued avoidance of traditionally masculine fields. Since the faculties in such departments are particularly male dominated, the subtle and not-so-subtle problems of faculty-student interaction are particularly acute (Hall & Sandler 1982).

In classroom interactions as well as in other situations, minority women often face the effects of double stereotypes based on race and sex. Faculty may be especially uncomfortable dealing with minority women and may act on the basis of a variety of assumptions about minority women's capabilities and attitudes.

Older women currently comprise the fastest-growing segment of the postsecondary student population. However, like minority women, older women often suffer the results of compound stereotypes. They are frequently devalued not only because of their sex, but also because of their age and their often part-time status.

Classroom Climate and Attrition

Unsatisfying or negative experiences in the classroom may contribute to high rates of attrition among students. In addition, it can affect even those who complete their education by limiting their intellectual growth, self-confidence, and career aspirations.

Although the enrollment of women, minorities, and older students has increased in recent years, the attrition rate among them is high. Women often feel less confident about their preparation for graduate school or careers than men attending the same institutions. This sometimes causes a decline in aspirations during their undergraduate careers (Astin 1977; Sadker & Harbeck 1982; Peterson et al. 1982).

A Harvard study on classroom climate (Krupnick 1985) concluded that male students talked much longer in predominantly male classrooms, i.e., in the situation in which the instructor and majority of the students are male. Furthermore, the presence of female instructors has an inspiring effect on female students. Females were found to speak almost three times longer under instructors of their own sex than when they were in classes led by male instructors. Krupnick concluded that "classroom environment, the development of self-esteem, and later on self-confidence in a profession, may be linked. The extent of students' involvement in class is a major factor in shaping their self-concepts because the college years are a time of important developmental change. Current research on the social development of men's and women's lives has determined that both female students and female professionals tend to have lower self-esteem than their male colleagues" (Krupnick 1985, 23).

Chilly Classroom Climate Affects All Students

A chilly classroom climate puts women students at a significant educational disadvantage. Overtly disparaging and discriminatory remarks about women, the use of "sexist" humor, and the devaluation of women's scholarship, as well as more subtle differential behaviors, can have critical and lasting effect. When they occur frequently--especially when they involve "gatekeepers" who teach required courses,

act as advisors, or serve as chairs of departments--such behaviors can have a negative impact on women's academic and career development by: (1) discouraging classroom participation; (2) preventing students from seeking help outside class; (3) causing students to drop or avoid certain classes, to switch majors, and in some cases even to leave the institution; (4) minimizing the development of the individual collegial relationships with faculty which are crucial for future professional development; (5) dampening career aspirations; and (6) undermining confidence (Till 1980).

But while women students may be most directly harmed by an inhospitable climate, men students are also affected. If limited views of women are overtly or subtly communicated by faculty, some men students may experience reinforcement of their own negative views about women, especially because such views are confirmed by persons with knowledge and status. This can make it difficult for men to perceive women students as equals, to work with them in collaborative learning situations, and to offer them informal support as colleagues in the undergraduate or graduate school setting. Moreover, it may hamper men's ability to relate to women as equals in the larger world of work and family beyond the institution (Abrams 1981).

In addition to its effects on individual women and men students, a learning climate that subtly or overtly communicates different expectations for women than for men can interfere with the educational process itself. If, for example, it is taken for granted that women are less likely to participate in class discussion and their input is either not sought or overtly or subtly discouraged, the contribution of half the class may be lost. If faculty reinforce perceptions that some fields of study are "masculine" or "feminine," students may avoid majors considered inappropriate. Thus, departments and individual teachers may lose students of talent and potential, and many students' academic and career options may be foreclosed.

The Penn State Environment

As previously noted, the classroom climate can be chilly for women students in a variety of ways. Penn State had quotas for women students

until the 1970s; while the quotas are gone, women are often made to feel unwelcome in other ways. During the extensive hearings on the status of women conducted at all Penn State locations in 1986, members of the Study Group heard detailed reports of just how the classroom may be "chilly" at Penn State. In some cases, there are simply so few women that they feel intimidated. In others, male faculty and students make it clear that they resent the presence of women. Women students may find themselves made uncomfortable when male faculty make derogatory remarks about women employees or reinforce the negative attitude of male students. For example, a male chemistry professor who reportedly showed a slide featuring a female scientist in a tight dress and then commented that "she has the right equipment" conveyed not-too-subtle attitudes about the role of women in science. Women in nontraditional fields are still being told they are doing well "for a woman" or being denied first-rate experience as members of laboratory teams. One engineering student reported being told by a male faculty member that it did not matter whether she learned anything or not, she would be hired just because she was a woman. Another student reported that one woman and several male students handed in identical lab reports: the woman was given a lower grade. Male lab partners tend to shut out females from participation. On another campus it was alleged that women in engineering never received higher than a grade of "C" from one male instructor. On some campuses, returning adult women students seem to be the targets for intellectual intimidation on the part of male faculty members. Although there were exceptions, in general women students reported having more problems on campuses that had traditionally served mostly male students and in those fields which have been male-dominated.

The chilly climate extends to advising, where a prelaw advisor can still find it suitable to comment: "Why would a pretty girl like you want to go into a field like this?" Or, what about the case of the female undergraduate whose interest in pursuing a double major was stymied by her advisor's reminders of marriage and children after college? Some women encountering such treatment simply leave the University for more enlightened surroundings. Others may well acquiesce, adjusting their choices of majors and later careers to ones that are more "acceptable" at a university more oriented to male achievement.

Penn State has had its share of truly outstanding women students. Women are student leaders and class marshals, and there has been one student body president. But these are in many respects exceptional, and their experience should not be considered typical, at least not without further study of classroom and college environments.

Self-Study at Penn State

At various times over the last 15 years, members of the University community have tried, through more formal research than the Study Group hearings, to examine the academic climate for women students at Penn State. A study conducted at Penn State in 1973 suggests that women students are more likely than men to doubt their abilities and to attribute their success to luck or hard work rather than to skill (Parker 1973). This indicates that women students may well have a special need for a college climate that specifically acknowledges them as individuals and recognizes their abilities, contributions and accomplishments.

More recently, a survey conducted by Penn State's College of Agriculture questioned women students on a variety of issues related to the climate within the College. The report's general summary includes the following: "Many responses to the questionnaire were favorable, reflecting the students' sense of good will and feeling of equality within the College. In addition, however, some students in nearly every major in the College cited examples and/or a sense of sex bias and/or discrimination" (Report to Dr. Gene Love, 1982, 1). Some of the report's recommendations are germane to the current report, for example: that the college faculty and staff must be made aware of the problem because "the primary problem perceived by the women in the College of Agriculture relates to prejudicial attitudes" and that increasing numbers of women faculty are needed, because "the lack of women role models was identified" (Report to Dr. Gene Love 1982, 7-8). The general conclusion was that the faculty of the College of Agriculture should take seriously the issues raised by women students and make plans to respond to them.

Sensitivity to the movement of women into nontraditional fields may be found in the report produced by the CONNECT Project (McMurtry 1981). It was reported to the provost that from 1977-80 admissions data show that women comprised about 50 percent of applicants in the Colleges of Agriculture and Science; by 1980 women applicants to Business Administration were up to 46 percent, and women applicants to Engineering and Earth and Mineral Sciences were 21 percent of the total. These data do not reflect special recruitment of women into these colleges, but rather the changing goals of women in the late 1970s. Even as the numbers of women in these colleges was growing, the University's major planning document of the early 1980s, A Perspective on the 80s, called for more women in the student body and greater encouragement to women to enter nontraditional fields. The CONNECT report recommended a number of activities to enhance both recruitment and retention of women students in nontraditional fields. As valid today as in 1981, those recommendations include serious study of the topic by following the development of support programs in the five affected colleges, attention to both admissions and retention of women, provision of more female faculty role models, and attention to the need for role models for women students. Indeed, the Study Group will be developing similar recommendations for implementation throughout the University.

All of the studies and reports discussed above have provided valuable information on the climate for women at Penn State. Nevertheless, there is a need for more and better data gathered across the University to give us a more accurate picture of the position of women in the Penn State classroom. While we might assume, for example, that the experience of the College of Agriculture would be similar in other colleges at Penn State, we do not have the data to support that assumption. A recent study of freshmen students in the College of Engineering (Levin & Wyckoff 1987) reports that, after controlling for factors including ability and interest, women freshmen in engineering appear to have lower grades in the "foundation courses" taken in the College of Science and to be more likely to transfer to other colleges than comparable men. The authors argue "that social factors in the general and/or academic environment(s) may be contributors to this finding. Future study in this area is suggested (p. 37)." We would add that one of

these "social factors" might be the chilly classroom climate for women. It is imperative that studies of classroom climate be undertaken in the College of Science and in other locations throughout the University system to provide a clear base for evaluating efforts to bring about changes that will ensure gender equity and an equal opportunity learning environment for all students.

Need for Modeling and Mentoring

It is well documented that people being initiated into a discipline or job need role models and that mentors are effective in the induction process (Moore 1980; Crawford 1986; Hall & Sandler 1982). Elements related to role modeling are access to appropriate role models and time and inclination of the models to serve as mentors.

Mentoring has been described as "one way for the young professional to obtain support in an organization and to learn the implicit and explicit ways in which the organization functions" (Fowler 1982, 27). The mentor may help "instruct, protect, and coach" (Keele & DeLaMare 1984, 36) persons in the induction process. New faculty (especially at the instructor and assistant professor levels), graduate students, and undergraduate students (especially in nontraditional career fields) are in need of mentors to improve their sense of self-esteem and their chances of remaining in the field. A recent study by M. E. Tidball concluded that "female role models are more likely than men to encourage women to go into a traditionally male-dominated career, such as medicine, and are also more likely to respond to issues relating to women students and so build students' self-confidence" (Project 1985, 5).

At Penn State, one major problem for women students--especially women graduate students--is access to female role models. Table 1 (page 13) demonstrates that women students have less access than men to faculty role models of the same gender, simply because there are considerably fewer women faculty. As the University has increased its percentage of women students over the past dozen years, it has not raised the percentage of women faculty commensurate with the student changes. This is especially true in career fields not traditionally

female, such as business, science, engineering, and other technical fields.

A second element in modeling and mentoring is providing time to do it and encouraging the mentor to accept that role. At Penn State that means time for out-of-class interaction, including advising and other informal faculty-student contact. It also means encouraging faculty to become involved in this task; faculty need to be educated in the need for mentoring and ways to do it. They also need to feel that such activities will be recognized in promotion and tenure decisions, that such activities are not only permitted but supported and rewarded. Without this recognition, women faculty are imperiled if they do assume the role of mentor.

Implementation Recommendations

The Study Group recommends that the University examine and, as necessary, enhance the quality of the in- and out-of-classroom contacts for its women students through the following initiatives:

Monitoring the Classroom Climate

Recommendation I.1: The Office of the President should direct the appropriate offices to study the classroom climate for women and minorities by campus and by college to determine specific problems and issues unique to each area (see, for example, College of Agriculture report).

Recommendation I.2: The Office of the President should require the inclusion of classroom climate issues in student and peer evaluations of instruction.

Improving Faculty-Student Interactions in the Classroom

Recommendation I.3: The Office of the President should charge the appropriate office(s) to develop handbooks for unit heads and program heads (one for the Graduate School and one for Undergraduate Programs) that include information on climate and ways to assess and improve it.

Recommendation I.4: The Office of the President should plan and conduct workshops to help unit heads, program heads, and faculty recognize the importance of classroom climate and practice ways to improve the climate. The Center for Women Students currently conducts such workshops on a limited scale and can serve as a resource for implementing this recommendation.

Recommendation I.5: In instructional units that are overwhelmingly male, the unit head should develop strategies to encourage women students and faculty to interact with other women. Such strategies might include participation in professional societies (e.g., the Society of Women Engineers), the provision of counseling staff as in the College of Business Administration, and the utilization of support programs for women that are provided by Career Development and Placement Service and by Counseling and Psychological Services.

Recommendation I.6: The Center for Women Students should be supported in its continuing efforts to offer regular workshops to help women, especially graduate students, prepare for and handle the problems of interaction between faculty and students.

Modeling and Mentoring

Recommendation I.7: The Office of the President should implement policies and strategies whose objective is to decrease the women student/women faculty ratio in order to increase opportunities for role modeling and mentoring. A first step should be to increase the number of women faculty through vigorous recruitment and retention efforts (see Study Group Recommendations B, D, and G in Recommendation Packages 1 and 2).

Recommendation I.8: The Graduate Council should study the gender imbalance in faculty to student ratios within the Graduate School, attending especially to the number and areas of specialization of women on the graduate faculty and to the need for mentors.

Table 1: Full-time University Park Students and Faculty by Gender and College or School, Fall 1986

Academic Unit	Undergraduates Total	% Fem	Graduates Total	% Fem	Faculty Total	% Fem	M UG/ M Fac	F UG/ F Fac	M GR/ M Fac	F GR/ F Fac
Agric	1,358	36.4%	368	33.4%	372	11.3%	2.6	11.8	0.7	2.9
Arts	1,018	47.2%	177	52.0%	134	17.9%	4.9	20.0	0.8	3.8
Bus Adm	5,320	45.5%	446	32.5%	123	6.5%	25.2	302.3	2.6	18.1
E M S	819	16.8%	496	16.9%	157	4.5%	4.5	19.7	2.7	12.0
Educ	1,418	78.6%	786	63.5%	124	25.0%	3.3	36.0	3.1	16.1
Engr	5,048	16.5%	806	6.8%	272	2.9%	16.0	103.9	2.8	6.9
H PE R	658	62.2%	139	56.8%	131	35.9%	3.0	8.7	0.7	1.7
H Dev	1,918	70.3%	230	80.9%	159	50.9%	7.3	16.6	0.6	2.3
Lib Arts	4,443	56.6%	743	49.5%	350	19.1%	6.8	37.5	1.3	5.5
Science	2,823	40.8%	652	25.0%	298	15.4%	6.6	25.0	1.9	3.5
Schl Com	814	57.4%	12	50.0%	6	33.3%	86.8	233.5	1.5	3.0
Total	25,637	44.3%	4,855	37.1%	2,126	17.1%	8.1	31.3	1.7	5.0

Sources: Final Distribution of Enrollment; Academic Staffing Patterns

REFERENCES

Abrams, M. "Preparing Men and Women Students To Work Together: A New Student Development Challenge." Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors 4 (1981):3-8.

Adler, Nancy E. "Women Students." In Scholars in the Making: The Development of Graduate and Professional Students, edited by Joseph Katz and Rodney T. Harnett, 197-224. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1976.

Astin, A. W. Four Critical Years: Effects of College on Beliefs, Attitudes, and Knowledge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Crawford, M. "Classroom Climate at West Chester University: A Report to the University Community." West Chester, N.Y.: West Chester University, April 1986.

Fowler, D. L. "Mentoring Relationships and the Perceived Quality of the Academic Work Environment." Journal of NAWDAC, (1986):27-33.

Hall, Roberta M., and Bernice R. Sandler. The Classroom Climate: A Chilly One for Women? Washington: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1982.

Hall, Roberta M., and Bernice R. Sandler. Out of the Classroom: A Chilly Campus Climate for Women? Washington: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1984.

Hearn, J. C., and S. Olzak. "The Role of College Major Departments in the Reproduction of Sexual Inequality." Pre-publication draft, 1984.

Jackson, P., and H. Lahanderne. "Inequalities of Teacher-Pupil Contacts." Psychology in Schools 4 (1967):204-11.

Katz, J. Men and Women Learning Together: A Study of College Students in the Late 1970s.

Keele, R. L., and M. DeLaMare-Schaefer. "So What Do You Do Now That You Didn't Have a Mentor? Journal of NAWDAC (1984):36-40.

Krupnick, C. G. "Women and Men in the Classroom: Inequity and Its Reminders." Journal of the Harvard-Danforth Center (1985):18-25.

Levin, James, and John Wyckoff. "Identification of Predictors of Persistence and Success in Baccalaureate Engineering: Implications for Academic Advising." DUS Report No. 1987.1. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, Division of Undergraduate Studies, 1987.

Maeroff, O. "Class Size and Success." New York Times, 7 February 1985, C1, C11.

McMurtry, George J. "CONNECT Advisory Committee Final Report." University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, July 1981.

Moore, Kathryn M. "What To Do Until the Mentor Arrives." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, Cincinnati, April 1980.

Parker, A. M. "Sex Differences in Classroom Intellectual Argumentation." Master's thesis, The Pennsylvania State University, 1973.

A Perspective on the '80s: Agenda for Action for the Pennsylvania State University. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1980.

Peterson, A. C., L. Crockett, and M. H. Tobia-Richards. "Sex differences." In Encyclopedia of Educational Research, edited by H. E. Mitzel, 1696-1712. New York: Macmillan, 1982.

Project on the Status and Education of Women. Newsletter, 15(2), p.5, Fall 1985, referring to M. E. Tidball, "Baccalaureate Origins of Entrants into American Medical Schools." Journal of Higher Education, July/August 1985.

"Report to Dr. Gene Love from the Ad Hoc Committee Charged to Determine status of Women in the College of Agriculture." University Park: The Pennsylvania State University, 1982.

Sadker, M., and K. M. Herbeck. "Women's Education." In Encyclopedia of Educational Research, edited by H. E. Mitzel, 2013-20. New York: Macmillan, 1982.

Sandler, Bernice R., and Roberta Hall. The Campus Climate Revisited: Chilly for Women Faculty, Administrators, and Graduate Students. Washington: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1986.

Till, F. J. Sexual Harassment: A Report on the Sexual Harassment of Students. Washington: National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs, 1980.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. "Between Teacher and Student: Overcoming Sex Bias in the Classroom." A Report of the Non-sexist Teacher Education Project of the Women's Educational Equity Act Program. Prepared by M. Sadker and D. Sadker. Washington, 1979.

II. DUAL CAREER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

General Recommendation J

Implement strategies that will improve Penn State's ability to attract and retain dual career couples.

Statement of the Problem

In years past Penn State, like most institutions, had little need to be concerned with the career situation of family units. The University's responsibilities began and ended with the recruitment and retention of the individual employee, who was also usually the family breadwinner. In the 1980s, however, the University can no longer afford to be unaware of the career aspirations and the economic situation of the whole family unit. Like other employers, Penn State is experiencing the effects of a massive change in the American workforce, as the traditional family unit relying on a single wage earner gives way to the two-earner family. In 1985 the Conference Board estimated that the number of dual-career couples had grown from 900,000 in 1960 to 3.3 million in 1983 (Axel 1985). The heightened career aspirations of women and the declining purchasing power of the dollar have combined to make employment for both partners a near necessity.

If Penn State were located in a metropolitan area, it might be able to disclaim responsibility for helping both members of dual career families find satisfying jobs. But many Penn State campuses are isolated, and University Park in particular is located in an area where it is the major employer, where professional opportunities are quite limited, and where transportation facilities are woefully inadequate. Increasingly, as universities strive to recruit top-quality male and female faculty, staff, and administrators, they are encountering the problem of dual career employment. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, which is located in an area with a somewhat limited job market, maintains data on why faculty members it recruits fail to accept offers. In 1985-86, one-third of those who declined offers in Academic Affairs (which includes all units except those related to Health) did so

because of spouse employment considerations. Furthermore, with a single exception, those who declined the offers were women, not men (UNC 1986). In the Study Group's own recently completed survey of Penn State faculty who belong to the 1975-78 cohort, 31 percent of the women respondents who had left indicated that spouse's job was one of their reasons for leaving, with 17 percent of the women citing spouse's job as the most important reason. We believe that the experiences of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Penn State itself show that improving the University's ability to recruit and retain dual career couples will be crucial to any effort to increase significantly the number of women in standing appointments at Penn State. Anecdotal evidence, at least, suggests that Penn State also has a number of talented male and female faculty already here whose partners have been unable to find suitable employment within a reasonable amount of time. The University runs a serious risk that it will lose these faculty within the next few years if it cannot find ways to assist the unemployed or underemployed partner.

Specific Problems and Possible Solutions

The Need for a Data Base. At present, the University has no data that would enable it to gauge the dimensions of the problems of dual career couple recruitment and retention. Apparently, it does not collect the type of information that would enable it to understand why searches are unsuccessful, why recruited faculty fail to accept positions, or why tenured and tenure-track faculty leave for other institutions. Such information should not be difficult to collect and maintain; it would provide a knowledge base that would enable the University to evaluate the dimensions of the problem and the impact of any measures taken to alleviate the situation. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill presently maintains such data bases and issues annual reports based on these data. The Study Group has already recommended changes in the Affirmative Action Recruitment Report and the implementation of an Affirmative Action exit interview (see Recommendation G in Recommendation Package #2). Examples of questionnaires used elsewhere in collecting such data are found in Exhibits A, B, and C in Appendix A.

The Need for a Centralized Job Clearinghouse. The University currently maintains University-wide listings of the staff exempt and nonexempt openings, as well as clerical and technical-service positions available at University Park. It does not, however, maintain such a data file for faculty positions. (For an example of such a file as maintained at the University of North Carolina, see Exhibit D in Appendix A.) The problem of knowing just what is available--or may become available in the next few months, when relocation decisions are being made--is further complicated by the fact that faculty positions are advertised at almost any time throughout the year, searches may be prolonged or brief, and there are no notifications when positions have been filled or searches suspended or cancelled. At any given time, even the most conscientious dean or department head would have difficulty helping a dual career couple find out about the jobs available or likely to become so with the area's largest employer, the University. Greater openness would also protect the University against charges that attractive jobs are being "saved" for the partners of highly sought-after senior faculty and administrators.

The Concept of the Dual Career Employment Assistance Program. In researching the problem of dual career couples at Penn State, the Study Group was pleased to find that the University already has a Spouse Employment Assistance Program in existence, fledgling though it may be. The program, which is operated by the Office of Human Resources, is for applicants who have been identified as a spouse of a current or prospective University employee. An employment specialist evaluates the applicant's credentials in comparison to existing lists of University vacancies (not including faculty) and refers background data to the appropriate unit. The program also provides the applicant with a list of other Centre County employers (see Exhibit E in Appendix A) and will make background data referrals to such employers as appropriate. The program maintains fairly close contact with the other two major area employers, HRB Singer and the State College Area School District.

The Study Group believes that there is an important beginning in this program. What is lacking at this time is a full-time employee who is specifically assigned to administer the program. Further, the program is hampered by the absence of a comprehensive job listing for

the University and a lack of contact with other potential employers, such as neighboring universities and small Centre Region employers. Also, it is not now possible for an applicant to come in and browse through job listings on his or her own. The program is not well publicized at this time, so that it is unlikely that couples, deans, and department heads in need of the service are aware of its existence.

Expanding this program and providing a full-time professional with clerical assistance to staff it could have a major impact on helping dual career couples find suitable jobs in the area. Even more important, it would convey the University's understanding of the seriousness of the challenge of the dual career family and its willingness to do its utmost to address the problem. The impact of such a commitment on the morale of those already here and on efforts to recruit dual career couples is potentially enormous. Any expansion of the dual career assistance effort does, however, imply a willingness to assist other area employers in solving their dual career problems. In other words, there must be a strong commitment to reciprocity if the effort is to be fully successful.

Recruiting Practices and the Environment for Dual Career Couples. In addition to the measures described above, an institution can greatly enhance its prospects for attracting dual career couples by modifying its recruiting practices in subtle ways (but not in any way subverting affirmative action principles) and clearly indicating that it supports policies that facilitate the dual-career family lifestyle (Sekaran 1986). The Centre Region has many advantages for the professional family with young children; these can be capitalized upon even more than they currently are. Although the University has no nepotism rules, it has not gone the extra step and stated plainly that it welcomes dual career couples as employees. The Office of Human Resources and the Commission for Women are developing guidelines on how to handle the issue of dual careers in interview situations. There is a clear need to educate search committees in this area. Among other things, the University should note that, to varying degrees, day care facilities are available to University employees. Many of the recommendations made by the Study Group in other packages relating to day care, flexible scheduling, family-oriented benefits options, and part-time appointments

would, if implemented, greatly enhance the Penn State environment for dual career couples. Many of these initiatives should also improve recruitment and retention of single parents.

At the same time, concern for the employment needs of dual career couples should not be used, however inadvertently, as a justification for failing to consider a fully qualified woman whose partner may present employment problems. The desire to recruit dual career couples should also not be allowed to impinge upon the University's affirmative action effort. These considerations underscore the need for the interview and search committee guidelines noted above.

Implementation Recommendations

The Study Group recommends that the University enhance its ability to recruit and retain dual career couples through the following initiatives:

Improve Understanding of the Dimensions of the Problem

Recommendation J.1: Develop a data base that will document why faculty and staff refuse offers or choose to relocate away from the University. Include in this data base information on searches that failed; tenured, tenure-track, and fixed-term I faculty who leave the University for another location; and individuals who are offered positions at Penn State but fail to accept them. An annual review of these data should be compiled, possibly by the Affirmative Action Office.

Develop a Centralized Clearinghouse for University Job Information

Recommendation J.2: Expand the existing University-wide file of positions (which currently covers staff exempt and nonexempt openings) to include faculty, clerical, and technical-service positions available at both University Park and other campus locations. To the extent possible, expand this file to include positions that are expected to become available within the near future. Make this file available on-line to individual job applicants, deans, department heads, campus executive

officers, personnel representatives, and so on, in addition to employees of the Office of Human Resources.

Expand the Concept of the Dual Career Employment Assistance Program

Recommendation J.3: Provide the existing Spouse Employment Assistance Program (to be renamed the Dual Career Employment Assistance Program) with a full-time professional and at least part-time clerical support. At University Park, establish more extensive contacts with Centre Region employers; at other locations, consider development of similar regional cooperative efforts. Provide access to a computerized job file (see recommendation J.2) so that applicants can browse through continually updated lists of employment possibilities. Publish a University-wide newsletter with updated employment information and other items of interest to help maintain contact with those individuals who do not immediately find positions and to assist deans and department heads in their recruiting efforts.

Improve Recruiting Procedures and the Environment for Dual Career Couples

Recommendation J.4: Make the University's positive attitude toward dual career couples more explicit in the recruitment and hiring processes. Provide information to applicants identifying advantages Penn State has to offer the dual career family. For example, information brochures could indicate the existence of the Dual Career Employment Assistance Program. Implement related Study Group recommendations on day care, flexible scheduling, family-responsive benefits, and part-time appointments.

Recommendation J.5: At the same time that positive efforts toward recruitment of dual career couples are being instituted, affirmative action principles and guidelines must be kept firmly in mind. Search committees should make every effort not to exclude women candidates based on the probability of their partners' employment. Dual career issues must not be allowed to become a basis for discrimination against women.

REFERENCES

Axel, H. Corporations and Families: Changing Practices and Perspectives. New York: The Conference Board, Inc., 1985.

Sekaran, Uma. Dual-Career Families. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Faculty Recruitment Review. Chapel Hill: Affirmative Action Office, 1986.

III. EMPLOYEE RELATIONS AND REPRESENTATION

General Recommendation K

Review the current personnel representative system and make necessary changes to increase its effectiveness and to facilitate the dissemination of personnel information. Review and revise the grievance policies and procedures for nonacademic personnel to create a climate more conducive to redressing employee problems.

Statement of the Problem

During the past two decades revolutionary changes have occurred in the work place as the economic structure of the nation shifted from a male-dominated industrial-base to a service-oriented, information-based society with greatly increased career opportunities for women. The Study Group has already documented the impact of these changes in our previous recommendation packages. As a consequence of these events, the mechanistic, impersonal operations of personnel management have slowly given way to a more people-oriented and humanistic approach. Even the new title of "human resource management" reflects this changing orientation.

At Penn State, however, certain aspects of human resource management could benefit from a reassessment and reorganization. Our hearings at University Park and the Commonwealth Campuses repeatedly identified employee concerns about access to needed personnel information. Several specific concerns were expressed over and over again. We consistently heard that employees and supervisors do not have basic information about personnel policies and procedures which directly affect them. Lack of information, misinformation and/or misunderstandings about educational benefits, sexual harassment, job classifications, grievances, and bidding procedures were frequently mentioned examples. This lack of information is compounded by an unusually small human resource staff for a University as large and diverse as Penn State. The ratio of employees to Human Resource staff exceeds reasonable limits in far too many locations.

A great many of these problems center around the role of personnel representatives (see PS-3 for a description of duties), who are not generally perceived by some employees as sensitive to employee concerns or as effective liaisons to top management for employee concerns. There is an overreliance on a cumbersome personnel manual for personnel matters. While documentation of University policies is essential, it is no substitute for supervisors and personnel representatives who are informed, concerned, and skilled. These problems arise in part because the personnel representatives are typically not full-time, trained human resource professionals. Few of the current personnel representatives have professional training and experience in human resource management. Instead, they are often professional staff employees with other responsibilities who are appointed by the dean or administrative officer of the unit to handle personnel matters. Because the personnel representatives must divide their energy between human resource responsibilities and other jobs (e.g., business manager for a campus or executive assistant to the dean of a college), it is very difficult for them to become proactive in serving employee needs for information or to instill employee confidence in their expertise.

Many of the women we talked to were gravely concerned about the confidentiality of their requests for information. On many campuses, for example, it is necessary to sign up in the business office for an appointment with the regional human resource officer. Personnel issues are often sensitive personal matters. This sign-up procedure serves as a deterrent to communication since the employee must inform someone other than the human resource officer that they "have a personnel-related problem." Issues of confidentiality also occur because of conflicts of interest that arise from the "multiple hats" worn by the personnel representatives. For instance, employees do not feel comfortable approaching their supervisor's administrative assistant with questions concerning the appropriateness of some of that supervisor's personnel related decisions. Instances of breach of confidentiality or reprisal for having questioned a decision have a force among employees far beyond the immediate consequences of any individual case.

Lack of training for individuals in the position of personnel representative is a major problem. With the multiple responsibilities

that these individuals currently have, they cannot be expected to keep abreast of University policies as well as all the new developments in the personnel area on their own. With the major expansion of the human resource field in the last several years, the initial orientation session that the University now provides is insufficient to prepare the professionally trained and skilled human resource professionals that the job demands.

Clerical employees, who comprise the largest group of female non-academic workers at Penn State, were particularly vocal in the hearings about having no channel through which their concerns could be conveyed to management. This is especially true with regard to grievances. Many clericals felt that their personnel representative did not have the time or commitment to discuss with them possible grievances and their resolution. Although the grievance procedure encourages employees to resolve differences directly with their supervisor, this is not always possible. When formal steps are required to redress a grievance, difficulties are sometimes encountered in the interpretation of the published grievance procedures, in part because each category of staff employee (technical-service, clerical, and staff) has a separate procedure. Staff and clerical employees may feel intimidated by the confusing array of guidelines. Technical-service employees appear to be an exception, as most of those with whom we talked felt their grievance procedure is more clearly understood and accessible. Given this situation it is hardly surprising that a majority of formal grievances (93 percent in 1985) are initiated by technical-service employees.

Another concern centers on the regional human resource officers who augment the activities of the personnel representatives. Each regional human resource officer has responsibility for several commonwealth campuses and schedules visits to the campuses to meet with employees who have concerns. The problems of confidentiality that reduce employee willingness to use these regional human resource officers has already been mentioned. In addition, at many campuses, employees are not always informed about the scheduling of these visits or cannot leave their jobs unattended to meet with the regional human resource officer. Moreover, the heavy caseload of employees and locations per regional representative is likely to foster a more bureaucratic form of response.

Collectively, these concerns create an atmosphere in which employees are not being accurately and consistently informed about personnel practices, benefits, appeals, and opportunities which affect their work and personal lives, and in which they do not feel that their grievances are being handled effectively. Ideally, personnel representatives and regional human resource officers should serve in a responsive and supportive liaison role between the employees and the Office of Human Resources. Instead, their role was frequently perceived by those we interviewed as one-way communicator (i.e., as a spokesperson for a tightly bureaucratic management). Personnel representatives were perceived as lacking in credibility, being inaccessible and mistrusted. While we cannot assert that these concerns were unique to the women employees at Penn State, we can underscore that women at several campus locations (including University Park) repeatedly voiced these issues. The Study Group recommends that steps be taken to improve communication about personnel practices and to increase the effectiveness of personnel representatives. These actions would have positive consequences for all employees at Penn State.

Implementation Recommendations

The following recommendations are offered to improve the communication of personnel information to employees and to create a climate in which employees' confidence in representatives of the Office of Human Resources can be increased.

Recommendation K.1: Develop a plan to phase out the current system of personnel representatives and establish full-time human resource officer positions with well-defined qualifications. Hire employees with professional human resource training to fill these positions. Increase the number of regional human resource officers to better represent employees at non-University Park locations. Human resource officers should be appointed by and report to the Office of Human Resources. Steps should be taken to ensure a high level of representation of women and minorities as human resource officers.

Recommendation K.2: As a short term, interim measure (until Recommendation K.1 can be fully implemented) establish a training program for all personnel representatives (administered by the Office of Human Resources) which will bring them up-to-date on all internal and external policies governing personnel practices at Penn State. Incumbents should be given refresher courses annually and encouraged to take courses in human resource management theory and practice.

Recommendation K.3: Review and revise the grievance procedures for non-academic personnel to create a climate more conducive to resolving employee problems. Insure that the rights of employees are understood by workers and supervisors, and that workers can use the appeal process without fear of recrimination.

Recommendation K.4: Set up a means by which all University employees can obtain confidential information from the Office of Human Resources. Consider the establishment of an 800 toll-free telephone number for employees at locations other than University Park, and include an answering service to permit employees to call during periods other than the 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. work day.

Appendix A

Questionnaires, Data File, List of Employees

EXHIBIT A

CANCELLED TENURED/TENURE TRACK FACULTY SEARCHES

The University of North Carolina
at
Chapel Hill

Please use a separate form for each search reported

Department _____

Position: ___ Named Professor ___ Associate Professor

___ Professor ___ Assistant Professor

___ Professor & Chair

Reason(s) For Cancellation:

What services would you recommend that the University provide which you think would support your department's future recruitment efforts?

_____
Signature Title

Please return this form to: Affirmative Action Office
104 Bynum Hall 0084
CAROLINA CAMPUS

EXHIBIT B

DECLINED OFFER OF A TENURED/TENURE TRACK FACULTY POSITION

The University of North Carolina
at
Chapel Hill

Please use a separate form for each individual reported

Department _____

Position: ___ Named Professor ___ Associate Professor

___ Professor ___ Assistant Professor

___ Professor & Chair

Race_____ Gender_____

Reason(s) Given for Decline of Offer

___ Accepted another faculty position at _____

___ Remained in current faculty position at _____

___ Accepted an offer in private sector

___ Remained in private sector

___ Spouse employment considerations

___ Other reasons _____

_____

___ Additional Comments: _____

_____

_____

What services would you recommend that the University provide which you think would support your department's future recruitment efforts?

_____
Signature Title

Please return this form to: Affirmative Action Office
104 Bynum Hall 008A
CAROLINA CAMPUS

A-3

EXHIBIT C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FACULTY LEAVING UNC-CH

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and its Affirmative Action Office are making an attempt to understand why faculty members leave. As part of this effort we ask for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire. The information you provide will be kept in strictest confidence and used only in generalized, non-identifiable ways. If you prefer not to complete this questionnaire but would be willing to talk confidentially about your reasons for leaving, please call the Affirmative Action Office (966-3576) and schedule an interview.

Department: _____ (optional)

Rank at UNC-CH: _____

(please check one)

_____ Academic Affairs
_____ Health Affairs
_____ Administrative Unit

1. Sex:
   _____ a) male
   _____ b) female

2. Tenured at UNC-CH:
   _____ a) yes
   _____ b) no

3. _____ a) Black
   _____ b) White
   _____ c) American Indian
   _____ d) Asian or Pacific Islander
   _____ e) Hispanic

4. Date and rank when first employed with UNC-CH: _____

5. Please rank in order of importance (1 being the most important) any factors that influenced your decision to discontinue your employment in the University.

   _____ a) another faculty position
   _____ b) change in direction of career
   _____ c) contract not renewed
   _____ d) anticipated non-renewal of contract
   _____ e) tenure denied
   _____ f) anticipated tenure denial
   _____ g) academic interests incompatible with present position
   _____ h) lack of congeniality in department
   _____ i) lack of congeniality in University
   _____ j) relocation of spouse
   _____ k) relocation because of change in marital status
   _____ l) lack of job opportunities for spouse
   _____ m) lack of opportunities for social interaction in the community
   _____ n) cost of housing
   _____ o) quality of local schools
   _____ p) parental or other familial responsibilities
   _____ q) increase in salary
   _____ r) other (please explain): _____

   _____

Please comment further on any of the above: _____

_____

_____

- over -

6. What are your plans for future employment?
   _____ a) faculty position
   _____ b) work in government
   _____ c) work in private industry
   _____ d) private practice
   _____ e) further education or training
   _____ f) other (please explain): _____
   _____

7. Please indicate all the factors that influenced you positively to accept a new position.
   _____ a) promotion
   _____ b) better salary
   _____ c) fringe benefits
   _____ d) better opportunity to pursue my interests
   _____ e) new university department more attractive
   _____ f) new university more attractive
   _____ g) new location more attractive
   _____ h) other (please explain): _____
   _____

   Please comment further on any of the above: _____
   _____
   _____

8. If you would like to make additional comments regarding how your experiences at UNC-CH could have been improved, or to mention those things that you have found most rewarding about your stay here, please do so below. (Attach an additional sheet if necessary.)

OPTIONAL:
Would you be willing to discuss these matters in more detail? If so, please give your name and telephone number: _____ _____
(name) *(area code)*

Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed envelope to the Affirmative Action Office, 104 Bynum Hall 008A, Campus. We appreciate your assistance to the University's affirmative action efforts.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
is an Equal Opportunity Employer

10/84

Nominations, applications and inquiries should be directed to the listing department at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

University of North Carolina
at Chapel Hill

EXHIBIT D

Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Vacancies
as of October 1, 1986

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Department/Unit	Position	Rank	Application Deadline	Starting Date
Anthropology	Socio-cultural anthropologist; social systems & political economy; ethnographic area open	Assistant or Associate Professor	12-31-86	7-1-87
Biology	Systematics and/or evolutionary processes of higher plants	Assistant or Associate Professor	11-10-86	7-1-87
City & Regional Planning	Field of planning or policy is open	Professor	12-1-86	7-1-87
English	Assistant Director of Composition; coordinate work of Writing Center & the Computer Lab	Assistant Professor	11-30-86	7-1-87
Germanic Languages	Specialization in the general area of post-medieval literature, e.g. classicism, expressionism, film and/or women's studies	Professor	11-16-86	7-1-87
History	Continental European History, 1500-1800, excluding England & Russia	Assistant Professor	1-15-87	7-1-87
History/Curriculum of African & Afro-American Studies	Joint appointment. Afro-American Historian whose responsibilities will include teaching Afro-American & U.S. History Surveys	Assistant Professor	1-15-87	7-1-87
Mathematics	Distinguished Professor - Particular interest in Partial Differential Equations, but all fields considered	Distinguished Professor	Not Specified	Not Specified
Philosophy	Seeking candidates whose research & teaching interests are centered in the areas of philosophy of language & philosophy of mind	Assistant Professor	11-24-86	7-1-87
	Ph.D. required prior to appointment. Candidates in any field of research specialization are welcome, although qualified individuals in the area of philosophical issues in feminism are especially sought	Assistant Professor	11-24-86	7-1-87
Political Science	Chair, Interdisciplinary Justice Curriculum	Associate Professor or Professor	11-1-86	7-1-87
	Senior position in field of Latin American politics (Comparative politics)	Associate Professor	Not Specified	7-1-87

A-6

EXHIBIT E

EMPLOYER LISTING

The following is prepared for your information and represents some of the major employers in Centre County

A.E.C. MINING EQUIPMENT
531 East Marylyn Avenue
State College, Pennsylvania 16801

Design and manufactures mining road headers and mining equipment.
Number of Employees. . . .50 Contact Person for Employment. . . . . .George Schenck
Types of Employment Positions. . .Engineer, Technical Jobs, Sales, Mechanics, Welders, Secretarial/Clerical

APPLIED SCIENCE DIVISION - MILTON ROY COMPANY
Brush Valley Road
Oak Hall, Pennsylvania 16827

Specializes in the manufacture and resale of chromotography supplies and accessories for use in gas, liquid and thin-layer chromotography, as well as fatty acids, reagents and lipids.
Number of Employees. . . .60 Contact Person for Employment. . . . . .Judith S. Ednie
Types of Employment Positions. . .Chemists, Business Administrators, Technical Jobs, Sales, Secretarial/Clerical, General Labor

BELLEFONTE - STATE COLLEGE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
315 West High Street - Bush House
Bellefonte, Pennsylvania 16823

Principle function is to actively solicit businesses and industries to relocate in Centre County Also assist in arranging financing through P.I.D.A. or local banks and introduce prospective companies to the community.
Number of Employees. . . . 2 Contact Person. . . Ed Jepsen

BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY OF PENNSYLVANIA
224 South Allen Street
State College, Pennsylvania 16801

Involved in research and service related to the communications industry.
Number of Employees. . . .86 Contact Person for Employment. . . . . James Walck
Types of Employment Positions. . .Engineering, Technical Jobs, Construction Trades, Secretarial/Clerical

BENKEYFIELD AND FARRELL
121 North Patterson Street (rear)
State College, Pennsylvania 16801

Evaluates, designs, installs and maintains building systems for heat, insulation, moisture control and ventilation.
Number of Employees. . . . 9 Contact Person for Employment. . . . . Charles A. Farrell
Types of Employment Positions. . .General Labor

BREON AND SONS ELECTRIC MOTOR SALES AND SERVICE
330 South Main Street
Pleasant Gap, Pennsylvania 16823

Sales and service of electric motors and generators along with an engine repair machine shop.
Number of Employees. . . . 4 Contact Person for Employment. . . . . L. Elwood Breon
Types of Employment Positions. . .Technical Jobs, Mechanics